

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Specification:

In the specification, paragraphs [0018] and [0023] have been amended to disclose that the bumper and hook respectively illustrated therein are shown in an as-molded state. Paragraphs [0029] and [0034] have been amended to more clearly describe that arrow (B) shown therein represents a parting direction of an associated injection molding die, and to describe certain features of the illustrated structures with respect to the parting direction. These amendments are fully supported by the written specification and drawing figures and, as such, no new matter has been recited.

In the Drawings:

The Examiner objected to the drawings as not showing: (1) "hooks extending from said edges substantially perpendicularly to a parting direction of said die in an as-molded state"; (2) "said nail projecting from said hook substantially in parallel with a parting direction of said die in an as-molded state"; (3) "said hole penetrating through said hook substantially in parallel with a parting direction of said die in an as-molded state"; and (4) "said hooks extending inward from an edge of said opening substantially perpendicularly to a parting direction of said die in an as-molded state."

As a result of the above amendments to paragraphs [0018], [0023], [0029] and [0034] of the published application, and the disclosure of drawing Figures 2, 3a and 5, Applicants respectfully submit that the features asserted to be lacking from the drawings by the Examiner are actually clearly shown. The drawing description appearing in paragraphs [0018] and [0023] has been amended to plainly state that the bumper and

hook respectively depicted therein are shown in an as-molded state. Further, paragraphs [0029] and [0034] have been amended to clarify that arrow (B) represents the parting direction of an associated injection molding die. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that no drawing amendments are required.

In the Claims:

Claims 1-2 and 2-14 are now pending in the present application. Claim 3 has been canceled. Claims 13 and 14 have been added.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indicated allowance of claims 5-7. The Examiner also stated that claims 3-4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the additional limitations of claim 3, and claim 3 has been canceled. All of the limitations of previously submitted base claim 1 have also been added to claim 4. As such, Applicants believe claims 1, 2 and 4 to now be in condition for allowance. Applicants have also added new claims 13 and 14. As new claims 13 and 14 depend on amended claims 1 and 4, claims 13 and 14 should also be allowable.

Examiner's Interview

A brief interview between Examiner Pedder and Eric M. Gayan, an attorney for Applicants, occurred on June 26, 2008. During the interview, the Examiner verified that the Yazaki Corp. reference actually relied on by the Examiner in his 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-2 was inadvertently cited in the 4/02/2008 Office Action as the Fuji

Heavy Industries, Ltd. reference. This was confirmed by the Examiner in the Interview Summary mailed on July 02, 2008. Applicants agreed to address the Examiner's § 103(a) rejection based on the Yazaki Corp. reference, so as to avert the need for an amended Office Action.

Rejection of Claims 8-12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for containing the phrase "one or more." Applicants have amended claims 8-12 by deleting the phrase "one or more" and inserting "at least one" in place thereof as suggested by the Examiner. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's § 112 rejection and allowance of claims 8-12.

Rejection of Claims 1-2 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either the Komatsu Chemicals Co., Ltd. or Yazaki Corp. references supplied to the Office by Applicants. As Applicants have amended claim 1 in a manner understood to render said claim allowable, dependent claim 2 would also be allowable. Consequently, the Examiner's § 103(a) rejection is now moot, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1-2.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have amended claims 1, 4 and 8-12, have canceled claim 3, and have added new claims 13 and 14. Applicants believe the claims rejected and objected to by

the Examiner are rendered allowable by said amendments. Applicants have also amended the specification so as to overcome the Examiner's drawing objections.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested. Telephone inquiry to the undersigned in order to clarify or otherwise expedite prosecution of the present application is respectfully encouraged.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 08/04/2008

By: /Eric M. Gayan/

Eric M. Gayan
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,103
Standley Law Group LLP
495 Metro Place South
Suite 210
Dublin, Ohio 43017-5319
Telephone: (614) 792-5555
Facsimile: (614) 792-5536
E-mail: egayan@standleyllp.com